

Remarks

In the Final Office Action dated August 19, 2008, the following rejections are noted: claims 1-9, 13, 15 and 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(1) as failing to comply with written description requirements; claims 1-6, 8, 9, 13, 15, and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Venkataraman reference (“An Efficient Bist Scheme Based on Reseeding of Multiple Polynomial Linear Feedback Shift Register”) in view of Distler (US Patent Pub. 2002/0099992); claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Venkataraman and Distler references in view of the Wang reference (“Generating Efficient Tests for Continuous Scan”); claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Venkataraman and Distler references in view of the Barnhart reference (“OPMISR: The Foundation for Compressed ATPG Vectors”); and claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Venkataraman and Distler references in view of the Jas reference (“Test Vector Decompression via Cyclical Scan Chains and Its Application to Testing Core-Based Designs”). In the discussions set forth below, Applicant does not acquiesce to any rejection or averment in this Office Action unless Applicant expressly indicates otherwise.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 112(1) rejection for the reasons presented in the Response dated July 29, 2008. Without acquiescence, and for the purpose of expediting prosecuting and reducing issues in case of appeal, Applicant submits that the present amendment renders the rejection moot. Moreover, Applicant submits that the present amendment is consistent with Applicant’s arguments as well as the Examiner’s apparent interpretation of claim 1 as applied to the art, and in particular to the Distler reference. Applicant notes that the Examiner indicated in a phone conversation that he is inclined to enter the present amendment to claim 1 and remove the § 112(1) rejection. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the present amendment after final rejection should be entered, and requests that the § 112(1) rejection be accordingly reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 9, 13, 15, and 18-19 because the Distler reference appears to provide no teaching or suggestion that would cure the admitted deficiencies of the Venkataraman reference, and thus the proposed combination does not disclose all the features recited in Applicant’s claims. In particular, it is admitted in the Final Office Action that Venkataraman fails to disclose, for a series of

n compatible vectors, selecting between a random fill process and a merge fill process based on the number n. Applicant submits that Distler also provides no such teaching or suggestion. While Distler appears to teach that random-fill and repeat-fill techniques may both be used during testing, there is nothing to teach or suggest the selection of one technique over the other based on the number of compatible vectors. Rather, the cited portions of Distler disclose that random-fill is used during one stage in the testing process, and repeat-fill techniques are used during another stage in the testing process. Moreover, there is no basis in Distler or in the record as a whole to link the use of random-fill and repeat-fill based on process stage (as taught by Distler) to the selection of random fill and merge fill based on the number of compatible vectors, as claimed.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 9, 13,15, and 18-19 over Venkataraman in view of Distler is improper, and requests that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The remaining § 103(a) rejections rely upon the underlying proposed combination of Venkataraman and Distler, which for the reasons discussed above does not teach or suggest all the features recited in Applicant's claims. As set forth in Applicant's Response of July 29, 2008 none of the additionally-applied references appears to provide teachings that would cure these underlying deficiencies. Therefore, Applicant submits that these remaining § 103(a) rejections are improper, and requests that they be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections/objections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
(NXPS.465PA)

CUSTOMER NO. 65913